18th December 1947]

Age of compulsory retirement.

31 Q.—SRI MADDI SUDARSANAM: Will the Hon. the Minister for Finance be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that there is a proposal pending disposal by the Government for increasing the age of compulsory retirement of Government servants under Fundamental Rule 56 from 55 years to 58 years;

(*b*) whether it is also a fact that the opinions of heads of departments have been called for on the proposal;

(*c*) at what stage is this proposal;

(*d*) when final orders can be expected; and

(*e*) want the view is of the Salaries Cabinet Sub-Committee on this?

A.—(*a*) to (*d*) At the instance of the late Reorganization Committee, certain select Heads of Departments were called on to report whether Heads of Departments should be empowered to retain ministerial servants for one year at a time up to 58 years of age, provided they continued to be efficient. Their replies have been received and the matter has been referred to the reconstituted Reorganization Committee for its recommendation.

(*e*) The last Salaries Cabinet Committee was not in favour of raising the age of compulsory retirement.

[*Note.*—An asterisk (*) at the commencement of a speech indicates revision by the Member.]

II.—MESSAGE FROM THE ASSEMBLY.

MR. PRESIDENT:—"In accordance with rule 94 of the Madras Assembly Rules, I have received a message from the Hon. the Speaker of the Madras Legislative Assembly, transmitting a copy of the Madras Estates Land (Reduction of Rent) Bill, 1947 (L.A. Bill No. 24 of 1947) as passed by the Assembly on the 12th December 1947 and signed by him for the concurrence of the Council." 11-30 a.m.

III.—APPLICATION OF RULE 63 OF THE COUNCIL RULES.

MR. PRESIDENT:—"Yesterday the House adopted a motion by the Government that the House pass on to the business next in order in the list of business. That is a very important matter. It requires further consideration. At what stage should the motion be made is a matter which requires further examination. Rule 63 seems to contemplate a motion actually made and the House must be in possession of such a motion before any of the kinds of motions contemplated under Rule 63 could be made. The Rule reads as follows:—

'*A motion that any meeting or business be adjourned or postponed or that the House pass to the business next in the list of business may be moved at any time and without previous notice as a distinct question, but not so as to interrupt a speech. If the motion is carried, the meeting*

[Mr. President] [18th December 1947

or business shall, subject to provisions of sub-rule (3) of Rule 15 be adjourned or postponed accordingly. Or if the motion carried be that the House pass to the business next in order in the list of business, the business then under discussion shall be considered to be disposed of.'

Rule 63 seems to contemplate a certain business actually under the discussion of the House before it can be passed over. So, I would like to consult hon. Members of the House on this question. Without meaning any disparagement to other hon. Members, I would like the lawyer Members of this House to study this question. We will take up this question day-after-tomorrow. I want a well-considered opinion and a ruling to be given for future guidance."

SRI R. SURYANARAYANA RAO :—" Then may I take it that yesterday's proceedings become null and void?" (Laughter.)

K. UPPI SAHIB BAHADUR :—"Are we going to have a discussion about this in the House?"

MR. PRESIDENT :—" Yes, in the House."

GOVERNMENT BILL.

IV.—THE MADRAS ESTATES LAND (REDUCTION OF RENT) BILL, 1947 (L.A. BILL No. 24 OF 1947).

THE HON. SRI K. MADHAVA MENON :—" Mr. President, Sir, I move—

'*that the Madras Estates Land (Reduction of Rent) Bill, 1947, as approved by the Assembly be taken into consideration.*'

" Sir, the House is probably aware that the Hon. Minister for Land Revenue who is in charge of the Bill is away at Delhi to attend a conference of Revenue Ministers which has been called to consider the problems arising out of the zamindari abolition in the various provinces and I have been entrusted with the task of piloting this Bill through this House. Of course, I shall anticipate the hon. Member Mr. Narayanaswami Nayudu and say that I realize my limitations . . . ."

MR. PRESIDENT :—" I would like to put it to the House: the Hon. Minister is expected here this evening; if hon. Members are anxious that the very same Minister who piloted the Bill in the other House should do it in this House also, can we have the Bill day-after-tomorrow? I leave it to the House to decide if hon. Members are very anxious to have the same Hon. Minister."

THE HON. SRI K. MADHAVA MENON :—" Day-after-tomorrow is a public holiday being penultimate Saturday."

MR. PRESIDENT :—" I thought we were having the food debate on the 20th instant."

THE HON. DR. T. S. S. RAJAN :—" It is not a matter of choice. If it is a holiday, how can we help it? I do not know. I would suggest instead that the discussion may be taken up tomorrow, sometime in the evening."